National Certificate of Educational Achievement

2012 Assessment Report

Technology Level 3

COMMENTARY

This was the final year for examinations to assess these achievement standards.

STANDARD REPORT

90676   Describe technologists' responsibilities to the wider community

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates awarded Achievement for this standard commonly:

• identified two professional technologists
• listed / identified some social responsibilities to the wider community (legal, ethical and moral)
• listed / identified the impact / constraint these responsibilities had on the technologists' practice
• identified how the technologist considered their responsibilities to the wider community and how they addressed these
• identified how the responsibilities promoted or constrained the technologists' practice
• understood the general role of the technologists, their responsibilities and some of the impacts these responsibilities have on the practice of the technologist
• could clearly explain the importance of the responsibilities and how these affected/impacted the wider community.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates awarded Not Achieved commonly:

• wrote about only one technologist's responsibilities
• identified technologists who were not professional technologists for example IT technicians
• gave an account of the technologist's qualifications and job responsibilities yet failed to identify their responsibilities to the wider community
• did not fully understand the responsibilities of the technologist or how they **impacted** on the wider community or the practice of the technologist
• identified some laws or moral obligations yet failed to explain how these were related to the technologist's practice (often a copy and paste of the law)
• outlined the practice of only one technologist.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

Candidates awarded Achievement with Merit commonly:

• identified two or more technologists
• identified the technologists' practice or outcome
• explained in detail the legal, moral and ethical responsibilities of the technologists' to the wider community – giving details and examples of laws etc.
• explained in depth **how** these responsibilities impacted on the technologist's practice and the environment, giving reasons
• clearly explained details of the technologists responsibilities with valid reasons, including why/how this impacted on the wider community.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

Candidates awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:

- compared and contrasted technologists practice – identifying and discussing their legal, ethical and moral responsibilities to the wider community
- discussed why and how these responsibilities may differ
- provided a full explanation of how and why the technologists practice is affected by their moral, legal and ethical responsibilities
- identified consequences for not adhering to the legal, ethical or moral aspects
- considered the wider community in a broader sense which encompassed people, the environment and other living structures
- gave very clear and detailed information on the similarities/differences in the practice of two technologists and discussed how this impacted to the wider community – discussion included valid reasoning.

OTHER COMMENTS

Some candidates discussed their own practice rather than a technologist's practice. Some candidates only wrote about one technologist, the standard states *two or more.*
Some case study material did not provide candidates with the depth of information required for in-depth reports.

Overall candidates could identify some responsibilities to the wider community such as laws and moral responsibilities yet they could not identify, describe or discuss how these responsibilities impacted or constrained the technologist's practice.

COMMENTARY

This was the final year for examinations to assess these achievement standards.

STANDARD REPORT

90677   Analyse an existing multi-unit production process

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates who were awarded Achievement for this standard commonly:
- identified an existing multi-unit production process
- identified most key stages
- described the influences each key stage had on the production process
- described **how** the development and continuance of the production process impacts on the key stakeholders
- described **how** the development and continuance of the production process impacts on the environment
- investigated what was happening during the production process, the influence each step had on the production of the outcome and the impact this had on key stakeholders and the environment.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates awarded Not Achieved commonly:
- did not identify a current multi-unit system or a commercially operating system – instead described a system being used within the classroom environment
- failed to include impacts on the environment or stakeholders during development.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

Candidates awarded Achievement with Merit commonly:
- identified a current and authentic multi-unit production process
- identified and explained (giving reasons) key stages of the production process
- identified and explained (giving reasons) the influences each stage has on the overall production process
- explained in detail **how** the development and continuance of the production process impacts on the key stakeholders giving examples
- explained in depth **how** the development and continuance of the production process impacts on the environment giving examples
- Considered the environment in a broader sense

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

Candidates awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:
- discussed at least two current multi-unit production processes
- discussed by analysing and critiquing the similarities and differences on both key stages giving specific examples
- discussed key and wider stakeholders, environments and processes and how these impact on developing and maintaining the multi-unit production process
- analysed production practices and how these impacted on the wider community

- discussed the impacts on key and wider stakeholders due to the development and continuances of the multi-unit production process
- compared and contrasted how each multi-unit production process impacted differently on the environment in terms of sustainability, and management during development and continuance.

OTHER COMMENTS

Some candidates are discussing their own practice rather than an existing multi unit production process.

Some case study material did not provide candidates with the depth of information required for in-depth reports.

Overall the results for this standard were very poor. Candidates could identify key stages yet could not describe or explain how the development and continuance of the production process impacts on stakeholders or the environment. A number of Candidates produced a flow diagram yet failed to explain the key stages of the flow diagram.

COMMENTARY

This was the final year for examinations to assess these achievement standards.

STANDARD REPORTS

90678 – 90680 – 90682 – 90684 – 90686 – 90688

ACHIEVEMENT

Candidates awarded Achievement commonly:
- described and a technological outcome developed by a professional technologists
- described properties of materials, ingredients, components used in the chosen outcome and gave reasons as to why they were suitable
- clearly described key materials and techniques used in the development of an outcome and gave examples as to why particular techniques were chosen
- explained properties of a material choice and how the properties influenced the production and/or function of the outcome
- described knowledge of processes and related materials used in the development process
- described knowledge of other disciplines, codes of practice, resources used, key materials chosen.

NOT ACHIEVED

Candidates awarded Not Achieved commonly:
- failed to identify a technologist or instead related the information to their own practice
- identified someone who had the required qualifications but who was not acting as a technologist in the development and implementation of the outcome.
- lacked knowledge on specific materials underpinning the development of the outcome
- knowledge did not relate to the outcome being discussed
- described knowledge about the outcome rather than knowledge used in the development of the outcome
- described a collection rather than a specific technological outcome with only information on practice and not the knowledge of pertinent aspects needed to develop an outcome
- downloaded information, did not reference information nor relate this information to the outcome being discussed
- bullet pointed notes, but report lacked detailed supporting knowledge.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH MERIT

Candidates awarded Achievement with Merit commonly:
- clearly explained how knowledge from a range of sources was used to inform the development of the specified outcome e.g. why testing and trialling was done and how decisions informed development
- explained in depth how the knowledge informed the professional technologist's practice
- justified the professional technologists practice when developing and implementing an outcome

- linked knowledge across a range of sources and provided detail on how/why key decisions were made during the development of the outcome
- could describe the similarities/differences in the technologists practice but could not describe details on the impact on their practice
- identified two outcomes developed by the same technologist yet the outcomes were too similar to be able to be adequately compared and contrasted.

ACHIEVEMENT WITH EXCELLENCE

Candidates awarded Achievement with Excellence commonly:
- identified two or more technologists and the outcomes they had developed
- clearly explained the similarities and differences in knowledge underpinning one or more outcomes – comparing/contrasting a range of aspects
- provided deep and critical analysis of the technologists practice whilst comparing and contrasting
- hypothesised and discussed in detail.

OTHER COMMENTS

Some candidates discussed their own practice rather than a technologist's practice. Some candidates compared their own practice to the technologist's practice. This often contributed to a Not Achieved grade.

Often candidates had one very strong case study followed by a weak case study. This made it difficult for the candidate to adequately compare and contrast.

The work this year was very formulaic and showed that a lot of the candidate's work was very much directed. In many cases, a lot of the essays were very similarly constructed with very little variation except for the sentence structure and wording that was changed around.

This is true especially with the ICT submissions. A lot of the same case studies from Techlink were used in a similar fashion.